

REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed August 1, 2003.

In the final Office Action, Applicant's Claims 1-18, 20 and 21 were allowed.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of these claims.

In the final Office Action, Applicant's Claim 19 was rejected as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,112,174 ("Wakisaki"). With this response, the rejection of Applicant's Claim 19 is addressed. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

On October 21, 2003, Examiner Nolan and the undersigned discussed the rejection of Claim 19 in a telephone interview. During the interview, Examiner Nolan explained his position that Wakisaki disclosed all the limitations of Applicant's Claim 19. Applicant pointed out structural and operational differences that distinguished the system of Applicant's Claim 19 from Wakisaki. To clarify these differences, it was agreed that Applicant would file an amendment of Claim 19 with an RCE.


Briefly, Applicant's Claim 19 relates to a system that provides geographic information and includes *inter alia* an "automatic speech recognition system." The "automatic speech recognition system" of Applicant's Claim 19 uses a "word list" containing "data representations of spoken names of geographic features." In order to facilitate recognition of names of geographic features, the number of words on the "word list" is limited to "only a portion of all available data representations of spoken names of geographic features." To that end, the "word list" contains a "first part" that "changes to include different words as the vehicle travels in the region." The "first part" includes "words" for "names of geographic features in proximity to the current location of the vehicle." In addition, the "word list" contains a "second part." The "second part" "does not change . . . as the vehicle travels." The "second part" includes "words for names of selected geographic features located throughout the region." Claim 19 further recites that both the "first part" and the "second part" are available to the "automatic speech recognition system" "at the same time" so that the words in either list can be recognized. This allows for recognition of names for geographic features located in

proximity to the vehicle as well as recognition of names for selected geographic features (such as popular destinations) not located in proximity to the vehicle.

Applicant's Claim 19 distinguishes Wakisaki. Wakisaki selects only one dictionary to be stored in a second storage section based on the location of the vehicle. (See, Wakisaki: column 2, lines 50-53.) Since each dictionary in Wakisaki corresponds to a separate geographic area and since Wakisaki uses only one dictionary at a time, the words and sentences available for speech recognition are limited to those in the geographic area around the vehicle. Therefore, Wakisaki does not disclose the feature recited in Applicant's Claim 19 of a "*first part*" and a "*second part*" of a "*word list*", wherein the "*second part*" "*does not change . . . as the vehicle travels*" and includes "*data representations of spoken names of selected geographic features*" that are "*located throughout the region.*" At least for this reason, Applicant's Claim 19 is not anticipated by Wakisaki and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 19 be withdrawn.

With this response, Applicant has addressed all the issues in the final Office Action mailed August 1, 2003. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank J. Kozak
Reg. No. 32,908
Chief Patent Counsel

NAVIGATION TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7371